For EPA Use Only ID #		
SECTOR		

Worksheet 5. Application Summary 03-0023

	is worksheet wi methyl bromide						e exemptions beyond the 2005 phase out	
1. Consortium Name:		Rice Millers Association 4301 N. Fairfax Drive, Ste. 425, Arlington, VA 22203 Rice Millers Association						
2. Location:								
3. Crop:								
4.	Pounds of Me Bromide Requ	-		2005	447,000	ibs.		
5.	Volume Treate Methyl Bromio			2005	218,000	(1,000 cu ft)		
6.	. If methyl bromide is requested for additional years, reason for request: To date there is no comparable and cost efficient alternative to methyl bromide for structural or storage fumigation.							
			7				sful in replacing methyl bromide for	
	facility fumiga	tion.						
	2006	447,000	lbs.	Vo	ume Treated	218,000	(1,000 cu ft)	
	2007	447,000	_lbs.	Vo	ume Treated	218,000	(1,000 cu ft)	

Place an "X" in the column(s) labeled "Not Technically Feasible" and/or "Not Economically Feasible" where appropriate. Use the "Reasons" column to describe why the potential alternative is not feasible.

Potential Alternatives	Not Technically Feasible	Not Economically Feasible	Reasons
Heat Treatments	x	×	equipment (\$2.5 million), finished goods/packaging areas cannot be heat treated, Huge capital improvement costs to
Phosphine	x	X	microprocessors causing severe corrosion costing approximately \$250,000 per year in repairs, takes 4 to 7 days
CO2	x		Cannot be use for structural fumigation.
Controlled atmospheres	×	×	Costly and cannot be used in all instances.
Contact insecticides			Cannot be use for structural furnigation. Works best with MB.
Inert dust	x		Not for structures, requires clean up, not for food processing a
Irradiation	×	x	Not for structures, unacceptable to customers, unavailable.
Pesticides of low volitility	. x		Not for food processing areas, crack and crevice treatment on
Steam treatment	x	×	Not for commodity, expensive to install and maintain equipmen
Vacuum treatment	x	×	Not for structure. Requires expensive equipment